



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 24 October 2017

by David Cross BA (Hons), PGDip, MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 20 November 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/F4410/W/17/3179479

21 Park Drive, Sprotbrough, Doncaster DN5 7LA

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr & Mrs Hewitt against the decision of Doncaster Metropolitan Borough Council.
 - The undated application Ref 17/00110/OUT was refused by notice dated 23 March 2017.
 - The development proposed is outline application for 2 detached dwellings to rear of 21 Park Drive.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Procedural Matters

2. The application has been submitted in outline with approval sought in relation to access and layout, with all other matters reserved for future consideration. I have dealt with the appeal on that basis.
3. The description of development in the heading above has been taken from the planning application form. However, in Part E of the appeal form it is stated that the description of development has not changed but, nevertheless, a different wording has been entered. Neither of the main parties has provided written confirmation that a revised description of development has been agreed. Accordingly, I have used the one given on the original application.

Main Issue

4. The main issue in this appeal is the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

5. The appeal site consists of a dwelling which is part of a short terrace of three properties. From the evidence before me, it is apparent that this dwelling was originally part of a semi-detached property which has been extended and then subdivided to create a further dwelling. The immediate area is characterised by detached or semi-detached dwellings with long gardens extending to the rear. I saw that there were examples of development extending to the rear of Park Drive in the wider area, although the properties immediately adjacent to the appeal site had retained their extensive gardens.

6. In support of the proposal, the appellants state that development on land to the rear of Park Drive has established a precedent for this form of development. However, I saw that developments such as Burghley Court consisted of the development of more extensive areas of land which enabled the provision of a more spacious form of development which complements the surrounding residential area. In contrast, the appeal proposal would result in piecemeal development on a site which was originally a single residential plot. The constrained character of the site would result in new residential plots of a restricted character which would be at odds with the layout and grain of adjacent sites with extensive gardens.
7. The access into the site from Park Drive would also be an incongruous feature occupying almost all of the space between the side elevation of 21a Park Drive and the site boundary. In comparison to the appeal proposal, I saw that the entrances to Burghley Court and land to the rear of 41 Park Drive were of a more spacious character and enabled a more suitable layout both in relation to adjacent properties and landscaping. In contrast, the proposed access would appear as a contrived, restricted and overdominant feature at odds with the domestic character of the adjacent dwellings. The appellants contend that the width of the access would be no different from the driveway serving the existing property. However, the existing double driveway is of a domestic character and its replacement with a long drive serving two dwellings to the rear would change the nature of this access to the detriment of the streetscape.
8. The access and manoeuvring areas would also create a disproportionate expanse of hard surfacing within the scheme. Although private gardens would be provided which would retain an element of soft landscaping within the site, these would be of a limited size for both No 21a and the proposed 'middle' dwelling, and would not overcome the harm arising from a scheme dominated by hard surfaces. Whilst the long access drive and manoeuvring area would not be widely visible from Park Drive, it would be apparent in views directly from the front of the site. It would also be visible from adjacent properties as well as setting an unattractive landscape for future residents of the development.
9. The appellants also state that, at approximately 8 dwellings per hectare, the development would be of a density which is consistent with the wider area. Whilst this may be so, this matter does not overcome the harm from the intensity and form of the developed area arising from the constrained layout of the plots and access within the site.
10. I have had regard to the benefits that would arise from the development. The proposal would add to the mix and supply of housing in an area of high demand, albeit to a very limited degree. The appellants also contend that the proposal would comply with the environmental role of sustainable development as it would have no unreasonable impact on landscape features or the character of the area, although for the reasons stated above I disagree with this assessment. Any benefits arising from the proposal would therefore be very limited and would not outweigh the harm that I have identified above.
11. I conclude that the proposal would be at odds with the established pattern of development in the area and would be detrimental to the streetscape. On that basis, the proposal would harm the character and appearance of the area. The

proposal would therefore be contrary to Policy PH11 of the Doncaster Unitary Development Plan 1998 which states that backland development should not result in unsatisfactory access or over-intensive development, amongst other things. The proposal would also conflict with Policies CS1 and CS14 of the Doncaster Council Core Strategy 2012 which state that development should enhance the built environment and make a positive contribution to achieving the qualities of a successful place. The proposal would also be contrary to the National Planning Policy Framework in respect of requiring good design.

12. For the reasons given above and taking account of all material planning considerations I conclude that the appeal should be dismissed.

David Cross

INSPECTOR